SINGLE BENCH (4)

CF-1002

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR**

WRIT PETITION.No. (S) 4362 /2006 (S.B.)

PETITIONER

**ANIL KUMAR TRIVEDI**
S/o Late Shri, P.D. Trivedi
Aged About 47 Yrs. R/O
Kothra Road Vikas Nagar
Tahsil and District Raigarh
(C.G.)

**VERSES**

RESPONDENTS

1. **South Eastern Coal Field Ltd.**
Through, Chairman Cum
Managing Director, Seepat
Road SECL Bilaspur. (C.G.)

2. **Chief General Manager**
South Eastern Coal Field Ltd
S.E.C.L. Raigarh Region
Raigarh (C.G.)

3. **Deputy General Manager**
S.E.C.L. Gevera Project
Distt. Korba. (C.G.)

4. **Staff Officer (Mining)**
S.E.C.L. Raigarh Region
Raigarh (C.G.)

5. **Inquiry Officer**
Cum Senior Personal Officer
S.E.C.L. Raigarh Region
Raigarh (C.G.)

6. **General Manager**
(Legal/Indust.)
S.E.C.L. Seepat Road Bilaspur.
Chhattisgarh.

P.R. No. 4404/06 Presented by Shri Bashishtha Roy dated 11/8/06

RECEIVED COPY
11/8/06
CLERK A. G. BILASPUR

OATH COMMISSIONER
APARNA MALVIYA
CG-2073/96
Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

**WRIT UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A SUITABLE WRIT, ORDERS OR DIRECTION**

(34)

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

**मामला क्रमांक** WP.No.4362 **सन्** 2006

**आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)**

| आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक | हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश | कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश |
|---|---|---|
| | **18.8.2006**:- | |

Heard Shri Bhaskar Payashi counsel for the petitioner.

By the instant petition, the petitioner has challenged the validity and correctness of the order Annexure-P/1 dated 3-7-2006 whereby he has been placed under suspension on the ground that he is engaged in the business of selling and acquiring of the landed property.

As argued by learned counsel for the petitioner, the main grievance of the petitoenr is that without making detailed enquiry into the matter as to whether the petitioner is engaged himself in the selling and acquiring of the landed property respondents have placed him under suspension.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, I have perused the impugned order Annexure-P/1 in which after placing the petitioner under suspension, he has been asked to submit his expalanation within a period of 72 hours as to why disciplinary proceedings should not be initiated against him. The petitioner is at liberty to submit his explanation as asked for by the impugned order and the competent authority i.e. respondent No.4 is directed to decide the matter after considering the explanation submitted by the petitioner, within a period of 2 weeks from the date of receipt of the same. If the grievance of the petitioner is not redressed by the said order, then he will be at liberty to avail remedy available to him under the law.

With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Consequently, M.(W.)P. No.3381/2006 also stands disposed of.

**Sd/-**
**L.C.Bhadoo**
**Judge**

Parul

18/8/06